

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Leadership, as a process of influence, is multi-dimensional. Whether those dimensions are expressed as head, heart, hands or mind, body, soul or even technical, relational, and meta skilled; each dimension is required for the process to be effectual. This study began out of a misalignment, an internal dissonance, between what I read in the texts books on effective outdoor leadership and what I witnessed and experienced in practice. Emotions, were more influential that the text books explicitly stated. By understanding and using emotions in the majority of leadership skills, leadership became an art form for those influential leaders. I began to question the conventional teaching that I was being given, when the instructors teaching me were modifying the methods and tools. Emotional intelligence theory, I discovered, gave a language to those modifications, and some of the writers even made the argument that emotional intelligence is more important than pure cognitive intellect for leadership (Goleman, 1995). Could this be the missing link and the resolution for my internal dissonance?

Blindly hopping on the emotional intelligence band-wagon, although personally appealing, might not be the best course of action for outdoor leadership research. This study is an attempt to clarify the unique contexts of both outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence, and explore the correlations between the two so that future researchers into outdoor leadership, myself included, can be confident that emotional intelligence has a place in outdoor leadership – just how important that place is remains to be seen. I will also attempt to apply this new understanding into my leadership

practice and outline a few ways in which emotional intelligence can increase the potency of the outdoor field.

I enter this study, fully anticipating that I will scrutinise aspects of my own leadership as I begin to grasp the level of emotional intelligence I possess. This self-exploration is not intentional, but I understand that in trying to argue against an emotionally detached leadership, it would be odd to perform an emotionally detached exploration of leadership. I also expect to struggle at keeping an unbiased tone to my writing; since I am writing about emotions, specifically the impact emotions have on intellect and leadership, chances are I will be applying my findings directly to my life and formulating preferences for one model as I go. Part of me, my academic part, apologises in advance for this. The outdoor leader in me offers no such apology since this is the reason for my interest in this topic; I believe that “leadership is intrinsically an emotional process,” (Kerr, et al., 2006, p. 268) and I want to explore this belief further. By the end of this study I would like to have a preferred model for understanding the emotional influences in my leadership qualities. My hope and intention is that the reader will also develop a preference, and if I have done my job the reader should have enough understanding of the two fields to disagree with me if they wish.

1.1 Rationale

1.1.1 Educational Context

During my outdoor training and education, I read texts on how an outdoor leader should process information and develop ‘meta’ skills in order to be effective. The outdoor leadership texts describe very structured processes so that I, as the student, can

systematically work through each compartmentalised dimension in order to maximise my influence. These texts are analytical, cognitive in nature, and heavy on information with graphs, statistics and figures that illustrated leadership styles, decision-making and judgement processes, etc (Miles & Priest, 1999; Priest & Gass, 2005). As I progressed from a student to full time employment, I tried to use these processes, I taught these processes, I met other outdoor leaders who stood by these processes – at least in theory. This structured view of outdoor leadership was developed by Simon Priest and his associates and I still find this ‘Priestian’ influence entrenched in the words I use, but I also found something amiss.

1.1.2 Theory/Practice Misalignment

The theories and methods were good tools, but I rarely witnessed outdoor practitioners use them solely, intentionally, or commonly while leading. Instead, the leaders with the greatest influence used other tools (i.e. competencies or qualities) when faced with making decisions; these leaders conveyed their processes using a different language, an emotion-rich language. They spoke of how they felt, how group members felt, how a course of action would affect a group’s emotional state, or how a person’s emotional state affected their ability to learn technical skills. These leaders used both their emotional and cognitive abilities to influence group members, and thus conveyed empathy, sincerity, care and professionalism in their leadership. They spoke of the role of ‘intuition’ and listening to the ‘still small voice’ or having a ‘gut-feeling’ when faced with decisions and judgements in the field. It seemed to me that on paper and at a desk, Priestian methods were fine, in practice however, good leaders used something else.

What I found missing in the outdoor texts and journal articles was a conceptual explanation for the emotional qualities I was witness to; the language of ‘people/relational/soft skills’ did not adequately explain the extent of these qualities. I did however find an explanation in business journals and management texts. Emotional intelligence theory was prolific in the business leadership field, and seemed in my opinion, to be the conceptual bridge between the outdoor leader’s theory and practice. The more I read about outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence separately, the more the two seemed like a good fit; yet why were there no articles mentioning emotional intelligence in the outdoor journals? It was not until Aya Hayashi (2005) wrote a paper titled *emotional intelligence and outdoor leadership*, followed by Hayashi and Ewert (2006) in their article *outdoor leader’s emotional intelligence and transformational leadership*, that the two fields began to come together. Hayashi (2005), surmises that further investigation on the relationship between emotional intelligence and outdoor leadership “would be valuable for leadership development and theory enhancing” (p. 335), and that “emotional intelligence could be considered an important component of meta skills in helping outdoor leaders use existing skills more effectively in order to deal with situations involving both individuals and groups” (Hayashi & Ewert 2006, p. 225). Further investigation into the emotional intelligence theory revealed that there are three main conceptualisations of the theory, each with it’s own measuring tool (Bar-On, 2000; Goleman, 2002; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Which model were Hayashi and Ewert (2006) referring to in their vision of an emotionally intelligent leader?

1.1.3 Methodology

Hayashi and Ewert (2006) used empirical research methods and found links between (the mixed model of) emotional intelligence, transformational leadership styles, and the level of outdoor experience of their sample leaders. Although in their research they used and justified a number of measurement tools, they do not mention that the emotional intelligence concept has three main theories (mixed, ability, and trait), each with different testing methods and purposes. For me, the two concepts, outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence, had yet to be thoroughly connected. Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts (2009) in their synthesising work on emotional intelligence specifically state that “before applying emotional intelligence to various social and organisational contexts, an essential step is to precisely identify the specific contexts, needs, and purposes for which emotional skills are being applied” (p. 197). for in some contexts applying emotional intelligence is not relevant. Without first exploring and largely describing the concepts of outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence separately, then searching out correlations between the two, I struggle to see how the two contextually different fields can be linked for future research.

Gray (2005) explains that non-experimental research that use exploratory studies which, in turn, use literary reviews, interviews, and focus groups to explore what is happening, reveal more information about a phenomenon, and help to decide if more research into the phenomenon is worthwhile or not. Along with exploratory study forms, Gray (2005) also suggests that descriptive studies with the purpose of providing “a picture of the phenomenon as it naturally occurs,” (p. 32) and explanatory studies “with

the emphasis on discovering causal relationships between variables” (p. 32) are often intermixed methods of research.

Philosophical analysis, deals with analysing questions and/or concepts on several levels, one being linguistic familiarity between communities (King, 1998; Sehan & Stanley, 2003). Conroy, Davis, and Enslin (2008) state “basic philosophical analysis would surely induce the hermeneutical pause, opening out the possibility of both initial conceptual clarification at precisely the point where the issues are first described, whilst affording scope for ongoing alternative interpretations of the phenomenon and its underlying structures” (p. 178). I am unsure if this study will require a high level of prior instrumentation, as a “continuous refocusing and redrawing of study parameters” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 30) may be required. However, I agree that a level of pre-selection of methods is sound, especially considering the potentially large amount of data in need of analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Thus, using a mix of exploratory and descriptive study forms (Gray, 2005) will allow me to study a wider section of outdoor leadership writing, and two main emotional intelligence models, in order to find the most appropriate conceptual and linguistic links between the two areas. As Miles and Huberman (1994) state; “research is actually more a craft than a slavish adherence to methodological rules,” (p. 5) and that each study requires a blend of methods. My analysis will be limited to conceptual and hermeneutical issues to search out correlations between outdoor leadership qualities and the emotional intelligence concepts in order to determine if further practical and theoretical research studies should build upon this phenomenon (Conroy, et al., 2008; Sehan & Stanley, 2003).

1.2 Aims

Close to the end of my undergraduate training in adventure education, I wondered if my outdoor leadership training was encouraging an emotionally stagnant view of leadership. Perhaps even, I wondered, an emotionally ignorant one. Understanding a participant's emotions is recognised as an important aspect of outdoor leadership (Cockrell, 1991; Graham, 1997; Martin, Cashel, Wagstaff & Breunig, 2006; Miles & Priest, 1999; Ogilvie, 2005; Priest & Gass, 2005). However, when making judgments and decisions it seems as though ideal outdoor leaders must distance themselves from their own emotions /emotional reactions in order to be effective (Cockrell, 1991; Ajango, 2005). Perhaps not anymore, a few of the outdoor leader texts are starting to recognise the importance of emotions in judgement and decision-making (Graham 1997; Martin et al., 2006; Ajango, 2005). Martin, et al.'s (2006) paragraph on emotional intelligence, disappointingly, does not mention a leader's own emotional intelligence, only that emotional intelligence competencies are useful for "outdoor leaders in understanding the motivations, attitudes and behaviours of program participants" (p. 127).

Yet, despite the emergence of caring leadership (Graham 1997), and the inclusion of short sections on emotional intelligence in a few texts (Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005), it seems appropriate and pertinent to continue the work done by Hayashi and Ewert (2006) and draw conceptual and hermeneutical correlations between outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence. The assumption in these articles is that there is a need and correlation between the two areas, yet without any evidence of previous philosophical exploration into these correlations. This paper is an attempt to 1)

investigate the conceptual and linguistic relationship between emotional intelligence theories and outdoor leadership, 2) enhance the understanding of emotional intelligence in the outdoor education field for future studies and 3) discover if there is a clear case for the importance of emotional intelligence in outdoor leadership training.

1.3 Boundaries of Study

As this study does not include any empirical research, or case studies, it stands to reason that the boundaries could be wide and blurry. Given that research into both emotional intelligence and outdoor leadership are multi-faceted, extensive and broad in applications, it is conceivable that the present study could either go on forever, or get so bogged down in the literature that no clear correlations are drawn and no practical applications are recommended. This is less than ideal; so taking into account the three aims of this study being, to investigate the relationship between, enhance our understanding of, and discover if there is a case for emotional intelligence in outdoor leadership. I will endeavour to keep the descriptive study portions general in nature, only inducing “a hermeneutical pause” (Conroy, Davis & Enslin, 2008, p. 178) for description, when a greater understanding of the concept will aid the study and/or encourage future work in the area. I will now outline the three main EI theories and the three main outdoor leadership themes to provide a rough boundary in which to conduct this study.

1.3.1 Main EI Theories

As Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) attest “emotional intelligence has been defined and redefined so many times that it would be impossible (or at least, quite a lengthy job) to outline all the ways the phrase has been employed” (p. 92). The same

applies for the intricacies of each of the theories, and as there are three leading theories of emotional intelligence, I will examine only these three.

Firstly, John Mayer and Peter Salovey's 1990/1997 ability based theory postulates that emotional intelligence (EI) is a set of abilities, which aid in the recognition, and regulation of one's own and others emotions. These emotional abilities aid cognitive capability and growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1990; 1997; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Secondly, Daniel Goleman's 1995 and Reuven Bar-On's 1997 mixed model, which combines emotional elements of personality, social intelligence, and cognitive ability to allow for interpersonal skills, intrapersonal skills, mood and stress management to be included (Goleman, 1995; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Bar-On, 2000). Some of these competencies do not necessarily relate EI to emotions or intelligence (Shultze, Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2005; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005). Mixed EI theory also suggests that these non-cognitive competencies can and should, be learned (Goleman, 1995; Goleman et al., 2002). Thirdly, trait emotional intelligence, conceptualised by Petrides and Furnham (2001), can be understood best as incorporating elements of personality traits, as well as elements of social and multiple intelligence theory along with ability EI theory. The main separation of trait EI with the others is the way that it is measured, using exclusively self-perceived feedback methods and that the foundation stems from personality theories as opposed to emotion or intelligence theory (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

1.3.2 Outdoor Leadership

Outdoor leadership is a young and growing academic field; and outdoor leadership has been described as art (Graham, 1997; McDonald, 2000), skill (Priest &

Gass, 2005) or competence (Martin et al., 2006). These different descriptions of outdoor leadership, in my opinion encompass common attributes and qualities of leadership, which come under three main umbrella themes, those of ‘understanding’, ‘managing’ and ‘experiencing’. The understanding theme can encompass outdoor leaders’ base knowledge of applicable theories and techniques, an understanding of one’s self, of group members and, of organisational relationships, and an understanding of one’s own and others emotions. The managing theme encompasses elements of a leader’s ability to manage environmental, programme, and group welfare, while also managing the on-going issues of safety and risk, organisation, and self-management. Thirdly, the experiencing theme encompasses all the attributes of leadership that rely on the leaders’ experience; be that in individual activities, leading in a variety of settings, making mistakes, and how they learn from those experiences. I admit that many leadership qualities are found under two or even all three of the thematic umbrellas. Take environmental management as an example: a leader should understand weather systems and how rain might affect the landscape, be able to identify a good group camping site for a rainy night, situating tents for minimal impact as well as group comfort, and have had experience in heavy rain to order to make route and timing decisions accordingly.

I use the umbrella type terminology with caution, understanding the vagueness and generality of these themes.

1.3.3 Where the Two Fields Can / Cannot be Linked

A difficulty in this study will be to draw the line at where the two fields correlate or overlap and where they do not, based on an exploration and discussion of the linguistics and literature alone. There appears to be a similar language in both fields and

it will be my attempt to analyse the terminology to reveal any common meaning. Both fields have experienced a growth in research and interest over the past 20 years and the terminology, concepts, theories, and knowledge of both are still evolving (Martin, et al., 2006; Zeidner, et al., 2009). The length of this thesis will be the major contributing boundary in this regard. Due to preliminary readings where it was discovered that 'trait emotional intelligence' is better understood as a subset of personality theories (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Zeidner et al. 2009), and the existing influence of personality theory in outdoor leadership I will not attempt to draw links between outdoor leadership and the trait emotional intelligence model.

CHAPTER TWO: OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP THEMES

2.1 Background

Outdoor leadership has gone through a number of conceptual and linguistic face lifts in its recent history. As the academic side of outdoor leadership grew, new models and theories that illuminated or added to our understanding of leadership were adopted, and formal teaching of leadership qualities began. A language of *technical/relational* or *hard/soft skills* began to develop, recently shifting to an incorporated *core-competency* terminology. This language echoed a conceptual shift away from leadership as art form. For this study I will use the term ‘qualities’ to encapsulate the attributes, skills, abilities, and competencies that other authors describe to avoid three things. 1) Switching terminology on a regular basis, 2) the static nature of skills and competencies (Warren, 2007), and 3) the sticky nature of semantics. Leadership qualities, for the purposes of this study, refer to the essential identifying nature or characteristic of an outdoor leader or outdoor leadership in general.

2.1.1 North America

Over the last 25 years in outdoor leadership writing, several main authors have emerged, mainly out of North America. Among them Simon Priest, Michael Gass and John Miles have jointly edited two main North American texts on outdoor leadership; *Adventure Programming* (Miles & Priest, 1999) and *Effective Leadership in Adventure Programming* (Priest & Gass, 2005), which describe leadership in terms of skill-sets. Hard skills “serve as the underlying medium for conducting adventure activities” (Priest & Gass, 2005, p. 78) and include technical, safety, and environmental competencies.

These skills are mainly context and activity specific, and “tend to be solid, tangible, measurable, and easy to train and assess” (Miles & Priest, 1999, p. 237). Soft skills, according to Priest and Gass (2005) include facilitative, instructional, and organisational competencies. Soft skills are understood to be cross-contextual and “amorphous, intangible, difficult to measure and tough to train or assess” (Miles & Priest, 1999, p. 237). For Miles, Priest and Gass the main skill set that outdoor leaders need in order to be effective are known as ‘meta-skills’. These skills glue hard and soft together to create an effective leader. Meta-skills are understood to be attributes such as flexibility in leadership, judgement and decision-making abilities, problem-solving skills, communication and ethics (Miles & Priest, 1999). These texts have been very influential as introductory level texts, especially in the North American context, but their influence has spread to other parts of the world. These authors, and to a lesser extent Cockrell’s (1991) curriculum text *The Wilderness Educator*, bring a highly cognitive/analytical approach to outdoor leadership and the expectation that new leaders will become effective if they use the methods and techniques outlined in the texts.

A new text on the market (within the last five years) is Martin, Cashel, Wagstaff and Breunig’s (2006) book *Outdoor Leadership Theory and Practice*. These authors deliberately move away from the Priestian language of hard, soft, and meta skills, and choose instead to categorise outdoor leadership as a set of ‘core-competencies’ which they feel are “essential to the practice of outdoor leadership” (p. xiv). The authors cover much of the same information as the above mentioned texts; however, they begin to incorporate theories, concepts and strategies from other academic fields new to outdoor leadership assigning links between them and their core-competencies. For example, the

authors include a small paragraph on emotional intelligence defining it as “an awareness of our own personality types” (p. 127). and linking it with only one core-competency, that of self-awareness and professional conduct.

John Graham’s (1997) book *Outdoor Leadership: Technique, Common Sense and Self-Confidence* is a North American text that goes against the scientific nature and Priestian language of leadership training. Graham describes leadership as an art learned over time rather than a science, which is learned from a single course or text (p. 11). He puts more importance on a leader’s ability to build relationships and the “subjective blend of personality and style” (p. 11) as opposed to the skills, techniques or rules for ‘objective judgment’ that others emphasise (Cain, 1991; Miles & Priest, 1999; Priest & Gass, 2005). Rather than differentiate between qualities Graham (1997) writes each chapter as a building block for the next, and mixes qualities together in each one. Although Graham’s approach made understanding the complexities of outdoor leadership easier for me during my undergraduate degree, he tends to view much of the relational-emotional qualities of outdoor leadership as ‘common sense’ and his lack of labelling or categorising makes it difficult to analyse his concepts in relation to the other texts.

2.1.2 UK, NZ, Australia

In the United Kingdom, and subsequently in New Zealand and Australia, a different way of understanding outdoor leadership has emerged in the past 25 years (Ogilvie, 2005; Woollven, Allison & Higgins, 2007; Crosby & Benseme, 2003; McDonald, 2000). The technical competence, knowledge and level of experience required of aspiring outdoor leaders have taken centre stage (Lugg, 2004; Nicol, 2002), and the more relational, facilitative attributes of leadership adopt supporting roles. Ken

Ogilvie's text *Leading and Managing Groups in the Outdoors* (2005), attempts to shed some light on the supporting acts claiming "it is only when technical skills are used in combination with leader and relational skills that effective leadership can happen consistently" (p. 65). Ogilvie does not categorise his leadership qualities as succinctly as do Priest, Miles, and Gass; although he does mention that categorisation is important (2005, p. 216-219), but prefers instead to talk about a leader's qualities, abilities and skills as different elements of leadership. The majority of his book focuses on the areas of leadership and management, which relates to the more inter/intrapersonal aspects of outdoor leadership; choosing instead to leave the technical qualities to the activity specific providers. Ogilvie recognises that emotional intelligence will have "significance for a nation noted for its 'stiff upper lip' and 'bad form showing your feelings' culture" (2005, p. 256)

Alison Lugg (2004) in her exploration of Australian outdoor education traditions, highlights that both UK and North American outdoor adventure education have historical and contextual tendencies to portray individualistic, masculine, stoic and competitive pictures of outdoor education (see Bailey, 1999; Humberstone, 2000) which are "expressed in the subtleties of language, framing of the activity, ... allocation of roles, and so on" (Lugg, 2004, p. 7) I believe that these tendencies are also evidenced in the value attributed to technical qualifications and skills and the language (e.g. Hard and soft skills) used to portray leadership qualities in aforementioned texts.

As a boundary to this study, the wealth of knowledge and academic work into the qualities of outdoor leaders needed to be synthesised into a manageable form. I read

through the texts and articles and began to cluster the qualities into groups. The common elements can be clustered under three broad umbrella themes and this study will look at outdoor leadership under these three broad umbrella themes: understanding, managing, and experiencing. These themes are not a new model for understanding outdoor leadership, only a necessary requirement of this particular study in order to make a large amount of information manageable for correlative analysis.

2.2 Understanding Theme

The ‘understanding’ theme consists of those areas of outdoor leadership associated with cognitive, emotional, social and theoretical awareness. These qualities tend to be internal in scope. It is seen that there are many ways of describing outdoor leadership, and that there is consensus among the writers mentioned that a leader needs to understand the emotions of others (Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005). Conversely, few of the writers mention leaders understanding their own emotions and how that may or may not benefit their leadership potential.

The writings on outdoor leadership ask that effective outdoor leaders have an understanding of the history and theories that have helped create the field. The postulation is, that knowing the background theories and history which have shaped our quest into the out-of-doors will ground them in a common ‘culture’; in turn this helps leaders understand the individuals and groups they interact with, thus making them more effective (Priest & Gass, 2005; Wattchow, 2007).

2.2.1 Understanding history and theories

Knowing the theories and concepts that have led to outdoor leadership as we now experience it (Miles & Priest, 1999; Priest & Gass, 2005; Ogilvie, 2005), and the history (Woollven et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2005; Lugg, 2004) behind outdoor education, recreation and therapy is often considered an important quality of outdoor leadership. This foundational knowledge is Martin et al.'s (2006) first core-competency, the predominant element of Priest & Gass (2005) and Miles & Priest's (1999) texts, and to a lesser extent, is interwoven throughout Ogilvie (2005) and Cockrell (1991). Without this foundational understanding, outdoor leaders run the risk, according to Priest and Gass (2005), "of not achieving the true potential of adventure experiences" (p. 12). Knowing a country's outdoor related history, and how significant events like the Lyme Bay kayaking incident in the UK (Woollven et al., 2007) or the Ptarmigan Peak incident in Alaska (Ajango, 2000; 2005), impact local, national and international policies and practice, can give the outdoor leader a greater sense of context and depth aiding in their understanding of self and others; especially the emotional consequences for those involved (Ajango, 2005).

Knowing theories such as Tuckman and Jensen's group development (e.g. forming, storming, norming, performing, adjourning), Bandura's self-efficacy/performance relationship, how success and failure affect a person's locus of control, Iso-Ahola's attribution of cause and Csikszentmihalyi's flow model (as cited in Priest & Gass, 2005; Ewert, 1989) can help a leader to make the cognitive links between what they see and experience in their practice. These, along with Gardner's multiple intelligences (cited in Martin et al., 2006) and White's effectance motivation theory (cited

in Priest & Gass, 2005) all contain emotional elements, which I will look at in relation to EI later in the dissertation.

The theories that I have mentioned are by no means an exhaustive list; other theories along with technical understanding, that is, weather systems, minimal impact techniques, how to test for avalanche potential and the like also find space under this umbrella.

2.2.2 Understanding self and others

The outdoor leaders' qualities in understanding themselves, close others, and those they lead are also critical components within the 'understanding' theme (Graham, 1997; Priest & Gass 2005; Martin et al., 2006; McDonald, 2000; Ogilvie, 2005). Self-efficacy, the perception that one can influence one's own actions, is concerned with understanding one's own abilities and one's own limits. Likewise, a person's ability to understand personality styles is of tremendous benefit to the outdoor leader and the first step towards understanding others (Martin et al., 2005). Understanding yourself and others can be partially influenced by an understanding of background theories, like leadership or personality styles; however, it is mainly born out of a realistic and continual assessment of the internal where, what, why, how and who. For example, in asking myself searching questions like 'where will this line of action or conversation lead to?', 'what are my words and actions conveying about my beliefs?', 'why do I want to lead?', 'how can I learn and grow from this?' and 'who is influencing me right now?' will give me, as an outdoor leader, a solid picture of how I operate. As Ewert states in his seminal book *Outdoor Adventure Pursuits: Foundations, Models, and Theories* (1989), "understanding an individuals attitudes, [fears, etc.] can help explain his or her participation in outdoor adventure activities" (p. 97); having an awareness and

understanding of where others are physically, psychologically and emotionally, are seen as important qualities of outdoor leaders (Cockrell, 1991; Graham, 1997; Miles & Priest, 1999).

In outdoor leadership, there is a fluid element to its qualities; qualities might happily exist under two or even all three themes. The qualities in this theme are foundational to those found in the managing theme (Martin et al., 2006), and cross-over is understandable.

2.3 Managing Theme

The ‘managing’ theme consists of leader’s facilitative, organisational and planning processes, which can be internal or external in scope. Managing might be best understood as where a leader’s understanding and experiencing come together to achieve common goals. I understand ‘managing’ in broad terms which include the qualities of outdoor leader’ship related to planning, organising, group facilitation, safe travel techniques, managing risk, programme design, creating and using systems and checklists, supervision and administration. Managing can also relate to a leader’s ability to deal with external factors, such as storms, and internal factors like stress. Leader’s abilities to manage themselves, their groups, and the demands of an organisation or a crisis, require them to have a high level of focus and motivation.

2.3.1 Managing environments

Having an environmental ethic, and managing a groups impact on that environment is a quality that few people, if anyone, in outdoor leadership would argue against; each environment requires unique management strategies on the individual,

group and organisational levels. Managing yourself and your groups within these external environmental controls is understood to be an important part of outdoor leadership (Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005; Cockrell, 1991). The following statements are examples of the different elements of environmental management. In England, strict country-side access regulations force outdoor leaders to manage routes carefully considering emergency access points etc. while in Scotland the open access regulations allow outdoor leaders more freedoms in route planning. In Canada, it is often all right to bring your dog with you into parks and on trails, whereas in Australia dogs are largely prohibited in parks, due to the protection of local birds and mammals. In the rainforest, a human footprint does little long-term damage, whereas in a desert disturbing the sensitive topsoil can take years to regenerate. Managing and developing the connection between people and the environment, is also emerging as an important part of outdoor leadership (Martin, 2004).

2.3.2 Managing programme

Qualities that pertain to managing programmes can be a challenge. Having to balance organisational pressures, staffing, money, insurance demands, and programme development can create stressful situations that many outdoor leaders do not realise when they enter the field. However, managing these parts of a programme, regardless if you are a guide or a director, allows leaders the opportunity to connect with people. Martin et al. (2006) offer these words of advice. “Managers must monitor staff psychological and emotional health.... Encourage staff to take time off if signs of burnout appear such as chronic fatigue, irritability, reduction in performance, and change in personality and

attitude” (p. 233). According to Graham (1997), “good leaders genuinely care for those they lead” (p. 75) and this should scale the organisational ladder too (Ajango, 2005).

Programme directors are not the only people who need the qualities associated with this aspect of managing. Group leaders, guides and activity instructors who facilitate group discussions, use challenge-by-choice philosophy, and foster community building, all manage programmes from a different angle.

2.3.3 Managing safety and risk

In today’s current legal climate, managing safety and risk in outdoor adventure activities is very important. Every outdoor leadership text mentions techniques for managing safety and evaluating risk. Whole books are even written on the subject (see Ajango, 2000; 2005) and Martin et al. (2006) regard safety and risk management as another core-competency. The qualities relevant to safety and risk management include courage and confidence, informed judgement, technical skills, self-awareness, ethics and virtues (Graham, 1997; Hunt, 2000; Martin et al., 2006).

Interestingly research on safety and risk management is revealing the influence of person’s emotions can affect how they react during and after a crisis (Ajango, 2005; Berman & Davis-Berman, 2002; Lois, 2001), and that a person’s mood may influence how much risk they are willing to accept (Blanchette & Richards, 2009; de Vries, Holland & Witteman, 2008).

2.3.4 Managing yourself and others

Managing our own personal equipment, technical development, time, and emotions is considered fundamental for effective outdoor leaders (Cockrell, 1991; Graham, 1997; Martin et al., 2006; Miles & Priest, 1999; Ogilvie, 2005; Priest & Gass,

2005). However, is not implicit in the term outdoor leader, that there are followers; other people, who we have and to whom we have responsibility? Is it not a truism that “adventure education [recreation and therapy] manifests itself in the actual world of human affairs” (Hunt & Wurdinger, 1999, p. 123)? Managing the physical, emotional, spiritual, and psychological well being of people in the outdoors it could be argued, is what outdoor leaders do (Ewert, 1991; Graham, 1997; Martin, et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005). The aspects of managing self and others that I would like to focus on in this study are those that emotions specifically influence. These include, but are no means limited to: setting and reaching personal/group goals and aims, a leaders personal input into group actions, balancing differences in group members, dealing with conflict, managing energy levels and moods, handling another persons stresses, dealing with a crisis, democratic decision making and a leader’s attitudes, ethics and values. (Graham, 1997; Martin et al. 2006; Ogilvie, 2005)

There are some qualities that only arrive from time spent doing, or experiencing, leadership. These qualities are of tremendous assistance to the outdoor leader and aid in the qualities mentioned above.

2.4 Experiencing Theme

Experience is the weathered yet warm face of the mountain guide with the small neat rucksack greeting you at the start of the trip with your name. Experience is the wry confident, welcoming smile on your instructor’s face, as you surface from the freezing cold rapid after capsizing your canoe; that look which says, ‘Hop in my boat and let’s

sort this out then eh!’ “Effective leadership comes with practice” (Martin et al., 2005, p. 68).

The third theme of ‘experiencing’ consists of those qualities which require longer periods to develop; they are internal or external in scope. These include areas like experience-based judgement, communication, technical expertise, and dealing with stress. Many qualities of outdoor leadership, which fall under the ‘experiencing’ umbrella, are found under the other two thematic umbrellas in a different form. My judgment and decision making tasks require learning from a large portion of meaty experience in a similar context (preferably my own, but sometimes through stories of other leaders) and a side of understanding and knowledge, then arranging these component parts into efficient, stylish completion requires careful managing of each part. Learning from these experiences in order to grow personally and professionally is an important aspect of outdoor leadership.

2.4.1 Experiencing Different Activities

Technical competence in different outdoor activities requires many days of doing that activity. All the outdoor leadership texts, and many certification agencies (e.g. Australia’s National Outdoor Leader Registration Scheme and Britain’s Mountain Leader Training scheme) mention gaining experience in technical competence, leading under supervision, and in different environments, as crucial for outdoor leadership (Cockrell, 1991; Graham, 1997; Langmuir, 2003; Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005; Outdoors WA, 2007; Priest & Gass, 2005).

2.4.2 Experiencing Leading

From personal experience, being in charge of a group is quite different from being a participant or even assisting in leading the group. During my first year as ‘the guy in charge’, I learned so much more than in the previous four years in an outdoor adventure degree programme. I even had an assistant leader who, sarcastically, called me ‘boss’. On my first camp, I experienced the pressure that ‘the boss’ has to cope with along with the rewards and the consequences of being responsible for 40 people in the outdoors. The texts often refer to leadership styles, and the situational/flexible nature that a leader’s style needs to have (Graham, 1997; Martin, et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005; Priest & Gass, 2005); Graham states “These insights [knowledge, visioning, etc] are invaluable as you test and refine your style, and deepen your experience as a leader” (1997, p. 36).

2.4.3 Making Mistakes and Learning From Them

Jasper Hunt, writing on the ethics of risk states that “the accident that is not openly discussed, not learned from, not held out as a case study for other practitioners and peers to examine, is an accident that is in its very nature unacceptable” (2000, p. 158). As much as leaders try not to make mistakes, we are only fallible beings, and mistakes are made. As Hunt’s words illuminate, if we do not learn from those mistakes they become ethically unacceptable. Ajango’s (2005) follow up book on accident prevention *Lessons Learned II* looks at the relational and emotional consequences of outdoor accidents for the purpose of industry wide learning.

Cain (1991) writes in relation to judgement and decision making that “the student *should* [Italics hers] be led to believe that only through being allowed to experience and make tolerable mistakes can he/she expect to grow and improve to the point that he/she can make the serious choices” (p. 28). This can be hard for a novice leader since there

seems to be an unspoken expectation that leaders have all the knowledge, and should not make mistakes (Hodgson, 2000; Raab, 1997). Experiencing vulnerability in leadership can be emotionally destabilising, however being vulnerable can create an environment in leadership, which allows mistakes to be made and learned from (Hodgson, 2000; Thomas, 2008).

The broad field of outdoor leadership incorporates many different theories, methods, tools, and concepts as a way of illuminating current practice. It can be difficult for a new leader to wade through all the information in the quest for ‘effective leadership’. Grouping outdoor leadership qualities under the themes; understanding, experiencing and managing, has been helpful in summarising all this information into workable, ‘bite-sized’ bits, for analysis. There is a danger; however, that during the reduction process valuable insights from individual theories can be lost. It was my quest to highlight qualities, which have the potential to relate well to emotional intelligence theory. Theories, models, and concepts not discussed are by no means less important as the ones mentioned, and the possibility still exists for other researchers to find correlations to emotional intelligence in areas that I have not. I shall now enter into exploring and describing the different models of emotional intelligence.

CHAPTER 3. Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence (EI), unlike cognitive intelligence, commonly referred to as IQ, is a young concept in the academic timeframe with the bulk of academic work on EI and its related concepts predominantly occurring in the last ten years (see Appendix A; Matthews et al., 2004). The concepts relating to EI however have been around since the early 1900s and according to Bar-On and Parker (2000) have “generated a rather large body of theoretical and empirical literature over the past eighty years (p. xi). Emotional intelligence theory has numerous definitions and models (Matthew et al., 2004; Mayer & Salovey, 2000; Shultze & Roberts, 2005) and like a pebble on a riverbed, the concept is currently being tossed and turned by the rapids and eddies of the academic river to prove its strength and smooth its rough edges. As Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) attest “emotional intelligence has been defined and redefined so many times that it would be impossible (or at least, quite a lengthy job) to outline all the ways the phrase has been employed” (p. 92). As with any concept, emotional intelligent research has its advocates (Bar-On, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Salovey, 1990; 1997; Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2009) and its skeptics (Conte, 2005; Shultz, Izard & Abe, 2005; Waterhouse, 2006).

Given the small amount of work tying EI with outdoor leadership (see Hayashi, 2005; Hayashi & Ewert, 2006; see Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005 for small paragraphs on EI), it is beneficial, for the purposes of this study, to outline and define the three main

branches of current EI theory: ability-based EI, mixed EI and trait EI, while also giving a brief history of the concept.

3.1 History of Emotional Intelligence

The academic writing on these concepts began with Thorndike in 1920 defining ‘social intelligence’, and Gardner’s (1984) theory of multiple intelligences expanding Thorndike’s work (Matthews, et al., 2004; Zeidner et al., 2009). The German psychologist Leuner, writing about women with low ‘emotional intelligence,’ first used the term in 1966; however, emotional intelligence was used in English language first by Payne in 1986, and then in the pivotal paper on the subject in 1990 titled *Emotional Intelligence* by Mayer and Salovey (Schulze & Roberts, 2005; Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2009). The concept, as it is widely understood, first described by Mayer and Salovey (1990), was brought into the popular spotlight by Goleman’s (1995) book *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Chances are that it took off due to its accessible language and references along with the general premise throughout the book that IQ is over-rated and that people do not need high IQ and perfect test scores to be successful in business and life (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Matthews, et al., 2004; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner et al., 2009). Since Goleman’s (1995) book, the concept has received a remarkable growth in academic and non-academic interest (Matthews et al., 2004; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000; 2004), as well as a growth in payable services offering testing and instruction in EI.

3.2 Ability EI model

The definition of emotional intelligence put forth by Mayer and Salovey (1990; 1997) “involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and / or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (1997, p. 5). This definition of ability EI is often cited for research purposes (see Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Groves, McEnrue & Shen, 2008; Hayashi, 2005, 2006; Jordan, Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton & Boyle, 2006).

Mayer and Salovey emphasise that an understanding of EI’s “two component terms, *intelligence* and *emotion*[italics theirs]” (1997, p. 4) is required in order to understand why the concept is labelled as such. Ability emotional intelligence focuses on cognitive-emotional abilities, and as such is understood to be similar to other intelligences in that, people with higher EI could be equated to being superior to people with lower EI, (Zeidner, et al. 2009) and the measurement of these abilities is based on a right or wrong answer (maximal performance) test (Matthews et al., 2004; Mayer, et al., 2004). The widely recognised test for ability EI is the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and according to Zeidner, Matthews and Roberts (2009), is being met with varied success.

3.2.1 4-Branch Model

Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2004) outline research on the abilities and skills of EI under the four headings or branches (see Appendix B) of “the ability to (a) perceive emotion, (b) use emotion to facilitate thought, (c) understand emotions, and (d) manage emotion” (p. 199; see Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Branch I, Perceiving emotion, is

understood as how one recognises emotion through verbal and non-verbal expression, be it posture, vocal tone, facial expressions, and so forth. Branch II, the use of emotions to assist cognitive thinking, such as during judgements and decision-making, can assist and or direct how one plans for future events (2004). Branch III, understanding emotions, includes analysing emotions and appreciating trends and outcomes related to emotion. Finally Branch IV, manage emotion, occurs within the context of “an individuals goals, self-knowledge, and social awareness” (p. 199). This fourth branch also involves the integration of emotional abilities into wider personality (2004). Each of these branches contains a range of abilities that start at birth and can be expanded as one grows and experiences life (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

3.2.2 Perception, Appraisal and Expression of Emotion

Branch I of Mayer, Salovey & Caruso’s (2004) EI model deals with the perception, appraisal and expression of emotion and includes the ability to identify emotion in physical posture, thoughts, feelings, other people, art work, and designs, perhaps even in nature. It also includes the ability to express and verbalise personal emotions, and discern the accuracy and honesty of emotional expressions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer et al., 2004; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005).

3.2.3 Emotional Facilitation of Thinking

The second branch (II) “describes the use of emotions to enhance reasoning and proposed various emotional events that assist in intellectual processing” (Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005, p. 36). Emotions act as the body’s car alarm, alerting us to physical and environmental changes (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), acting on the information given before consequences are received are considered as aspects of this branch. Abilities in

this branch include the emotional relationship to judgement and decision making, how mood can change perspective and encourage different points of view, and how emotive states can facilitate inductive or deductive reasoning (Blanchette & Richards, 2009; de Vries et al., 2008; Mayer, et al. 2004). The ability to “generate emotions ‘on demand’” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 12), can help develop the understanding of emotions, permitting, “immediate, real-time inspection of the feeling and its characteristics” (p. 12) and help in developing a plan to handle the feeling. These first two branches encompass a basic level of emotion-related abilities, whereas branches III and IV move toward higher levels of ability (Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005).

3.2.4 Understanding and Analysing Emotions

Branch III, consists of the cognitive processing of emotions and how one employs this emotional knowledge with abstract information such as recognising the transition from fear to shame or which emotions combine to create awe. Essentially how one understands and then uses emotional knowledge. Some emotions can seem contradictory to their context (e.g. laughing when in pain, crying when happy) and thus the recognition of contradictory, blended or transitioning emotions is found in this branch (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005).

3.2.5 Reflective Regulation of Emotions

The last branch (IV), refers to the cognitive management of ones own and others emotions, both pleasant and unpleasant, in order to promote growth. This branch according to Neubauer & Freudenthaler, “represents an interface of many factors including motivational, emotional and cognitive factors that must be recognized[sic] and balanced in order to manage and cope with feelings successfully” (2005, p. 36). This

fourth branch is important both for effective communication, given the effect of emotions on the interpretation and conveyance of information (Blanchette & Richards, 2009; de Vries, et al., 2008), and for growth in that “only if a person attends to feelings can something be learned about them” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p.14). Mayer, Salovey & Caruso (2000) state that EI is often understood merely as this fourth branch, emotional management. Interesting aspects of this fourth branch for outdoor leadership are abilities relating to emotional control. Knowing when to suppress anxiety for clear thinking, or when to use joy or urgency to motivate a down trodden group fit into this branch, labelled by Mayer and Salovey (1997) as “meta-evaluation and meta-regulation” (p. 14). The authors also state that an emotionally intelligent person should understand emotions “without exaggerating or minimizing their importance” (p. 15).

Despite pioneering the emotional intelligence movement of today, Mayer and Salovey’s model has been shadowed by the mixed EI models of Goleman and Bar-On largely due to its use of everyday terminology and non-academic marketing. These are the next models that I will explore.

3.3 Bar-On’s Mixed EI

Bar-On (2007a; 2007b) offers another model for EI, known as a mixed model and defines it as “a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how well we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands, challenges and pressures” (2007a). The Bar-On model includes 15 key elements to emotional and social intelligence, which he distilled down to 10 a few years later (Bar-On, 2000; 2007b;

Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005). Five composite areas (see Appendix C) emerged from these key elements, these are: intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management, and general mood (Bar-On, 2000; Zeidner et al., 2009). Neubauer and Freudenthaler (2005) note that one difficulty to Bar-On's mixed model is that it includes broader social skills as well as emotion-related mental abilities and thus "the appropriateness of the term *emotional intelligence*[italics theirs] seems rather questionable" (p. 42). One testing method, Bar-On's EQ-i (described in Bar-On, 2000, p. 364-366), is a "self-report measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior[sic]" (2000, p. 364) and is used as part of Hayashi and Ewert's (2006) research. The EQ-i, as a self-report measure, has come under criticism due to its lack of convergent and divergent validity; despite this criticism Bar-On's EI model is understood to be the most popular and reliable mixed model in circulation (see Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2009, p. 116).

Bar-On's composite areas, used by most mixed EI researchers, are outlined below and will be used as the main mixed EI model in my analysis.

3.3.1 Intrapersonal Skills

Intrapersonal skills, according to the mixed EI model (Bar-On, 2000) include three factors; self-regard, assertiveness, and emotional self-awareness. Self-regard is understood as a general awareness, understanding, and acceptance of oneself.

Assertiveness is the expression of one's desires, needs, emotions and ideas. Emotional self-awareness is similar to self-regard just cloistered around one's emotions. (see Bar-On, 2000; 2007b; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner, et al., 2009)

3.3.2 Interpersonal Skills

Interpersonal skills relate to our interactions with others, in the mixed model of EI; this includes empathy and interpersonal relationships. Empathy, is an awareness and understanding of others' emotions. Interpersonal relationships can be understood as the formation and maintenance of intimate relationships. (see Bar-On, 2000; 2007b; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner, et al., 2009)

3.3.3 Adaptability

Adaptability, the third dimension of mixed EI, comprises problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility. Reality testing is the method of affirming one's thinking and feelings against external information. Flexibility refers to manipulating feelings, thoughts, and behaviour according to changing conditions. Problem solving relates the constructive solving of personal and social issues. (see Bar-On, 2000; 2007b; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner, et al., 2009)

3.3.4 Stress Management

Bar-On sees stress management as including stress tolerance, and impulse control. Stress tolerance refers to coping with stress in an active and positive manor. Impulse control is "resisting or delaying an impulse or drive, and controlling one's emotions" (Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005, p. 41; see Bar-On, 2000; 2007b; Zeidner, et al., 2009).

3.3.5 Facilitators to EI

Originally, Bar-On included happiness, optimism, self-actualisation, independence, and social-responsibility as factors included in EI. In 2000, his revised model removed these as component factors and instead labelled them as 'facilitators' to emotional and social intelligence (cited in Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005). Since they are not current component factors, and have received some criticism for their

appropriateness to EI, I shall not include them as part of my analysis (see Mayer & Salovey, 2000; Zeidner, et al., 2009). Goleman (1998) includes many similar competencies to Bar-On, including optimism and happiness, as part of his model, which will be looked at in closer detail next.

3.4 Goleman's Mixed EI

Daniel Goleman, another champion of the mixed model, states that EI includes “abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one’s moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize[sic] and to hope” (1995, p. 34). He also claims “the crucial emotional competencies can indeed be learned and improved upon by children” (1995, p. 34). It is partially due to these claims, the approachable language, and the lack of rigorous science used in *Emotional Intelligence* (1995), that much of the empirical work into EI began (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005). Pursuant to these statements, a refined definition for mixed EI is that “emotional intelligence is observed when a person demonstrates the competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the situation” (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000, p. 345). Goleman (1995) also asserts “emotional aptitude is a *meta-ability*[italics his], determining how well we can use whatever skills we have, including raw intellect” (p. 36). Due to this assertion it is understandable that most of the writings about EI in outdoor leadership texts are based on the mixed EI model (Ogilvie, 2005; Hayashi & Ewert, 2006; Martin et al. 2006).

Goleman's (1995; 1998) model may be better understood as a model of emotional competencies; however, Goleman asserts that the level of emotional intelligence one has (based on Mayer & Salovey's 1990 concept) determines the potential one has for learning the different emotional skills. Therefore, competence in those skills illumines just how much of that potential has been transferred into one's life contexts. APPENDIX D shows all five emotional intelligence elements according to Goleman's (1998) mixed model. Below I outline Goleman et al.'s (2002) current understanding of their model, alluding to the 1998 concept for breadth of understanding. These broad elements are: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (2002, p. 253-256).

Before continuing, it should be mentioned that Goleman and colleagues developed a measurement tool for their concept, known as the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). Zeidner, et al. (2009) are suspicious of this measurement tool stating "right now we think it is imperative for the developers of the ECI to conduct more rigorous validity studies ... [because] right now, we cannot decide about its validity, which is a sad state-of-affairs for an instrument that is being peddled in some professional quarters" (p. 124). Given the current doubt into the ECI as a measurement tool (Conte, 2005; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Matthews, et al., 2004; Zeidner, et al., 2009), it would be daring for future researchers into the EI of outdoor leaders to adopt it. Despite all of this information, there is popularity in Goleman and colleagues understanding of EI and it would be inappropriate to not include it in my analysis.

3.4.1 Self-Awareness

Goleman's (1998) understanding of self-awareness, includes three elements, two of which, emotional awareness and accurate self-assessment are very similar to two of Mayer & Salovey's (1997) base level abilities. The third element labelled 'self-confidence', is "the courage that comes from certainty about our capabilities, values and goals" (1998, p. 54). Goleman describes people with emotional awareness as being able to perceive their emotions and the reasons behind those emotions, understand the links between their feelings, thoughts, actions and what they say (1998; Goleman et al., 2002); also adding that people will "recognize[sic] how their feelings affect their performance," (1998, p. 54) and they will "have a guiding awareness of their values and goals" (p. 54).

According to Goleman (1998), good leaders know themselves well. Having an accurate self-assessment involves being aware of strengths and weaknesses, being open to honest feedback, reflectively learning from experience, and seeking out new perspectives and self-development (1998; 2002). People with self-confidence, according to Goleman have "a strong sense of self-worth and capabilities," (1998, p. 68) which means having the courage to make decisions, popular or unpopular, and to stick by them. These "leaders often have a sense of presence, a self-assurance that lets them stand out in a group" (Goleman, et al., 2002, p. 254).

3.4.2 Self-Management

Self-management (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002), basically outlines competencies that allow a person to handle their emotional impulses and manage emotionally related consequences. Goleman (1998) includes self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, and innovation under this category. Despite, no apparent relation to Mayer & Salovey's ability EI model or Bar-On's mixed

model in this area, and in asking the question “what does trustworthiness have to do with emotional intelligence” further examination of what Goleman means in these terms reveals some similarities. Self-control as an example is more than just repression of emotions to get a job done; Goleman also mentions that the ability to create emotions is an element of self-regulation (1998). In Goleman, et al.’s (2002) reconfiguration, trustworthiness is replaced with a leader’s transparency – being open and authentic about feelings- which leads to integrity and willingness to admit mistakes or tackle unethical situations.

The next two competencies found within self-management, adaptability and achievement, have little to do with emotions or intellect, and rather, are related to broader skill sets (Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005). Adaptability related to a flexible, fluid leadership and achievement is understood to encompass high personal standards, set measurable goals, and continually learn (Goleman, et al., 2002). The final two competencies within this element, initiative and optimism, included a sense of efficacy and qualities associated with an up-beat personality like positive thinking, and the ability to “create better possibilities for the future” (2002, p. 255).

3.4.3 Social Awareness

The next two dimensions of Goleman and colleagues EI are centred on social competences, and leaders awareness of wider emotional aspects of their social context (1998; 2002). Social awareness in this case, includes empathy, organisational awareness and service (2002). Empathy in Goleman’s (1998) concept is a wider dimension of EI incorporating the understanding and development of others, service orientation (different from servant leadership), networking and a groups emotional / power relationships. In

Goleman et al.'s (2002) concept, empathy is a competence of leadership defined as “sensing others’ emotions, understanding their perspective, and taking active interest in their concerns” (p. 39) Organisational awareness and ‘service’ are more externally focused awareness’, based on a leader being able to sense trends in group actions or policies, and recognising a followers needs (2002).

3.4.4 Relationship Management

Competencies found within the relationship management dimension of Goleman and colleagues (1998; 2002) mixed EI model relate mainly to how well a leader perceives they manage a variety of relationships. Headings include; influence, inspiration, conflict management. Emotionally intelligent leaders are also seen as model team players; good at developing others, and are catalysts for change in a variety of situations.

Much of the synthesising work on EI done by other authors (see Conte, 2005; Matthews, et al., 2004; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner et al., 2009) has been suspicious of Goleman and colleagues mixed model due to the lack of reliable measurement (the ECI), and the high correlations between this concept and the Big Five personality traits –extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to new experiences (see Schulze, Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2005). There are a few models of EI in circulation which recognise personality traits as part of wider emotional competence. One such model will be briefly described next due to the increased attention it receives in the synthesis texts.

3.5 Trait EI

Trait EI, the newest of the three models, was conceptualised by Petrides and

Furnham (2001) and can be understood, in short, as “an aspect of personality concerning emotion-related dispositions and self-perceptions” (Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2009, p. 124). Petrides and Furnham (2001) distinguished trait EI (also termed emotional self-efficacy) from other models by how EI is measured, (with self-report measures rather than maximal performance measures like the MSCEIT) and in the understanding that EI fits more as a subset of personality traits (Van Der Zee & Webeke, 2004; Zeidner, et al., 2009) rather than intelligence. Petrides and Furnham believe that trait EI is not a new concept that stands in opposition to mixed or ability EI, but that their concept “tries to systematize and evaluate an approach that largely exists already” (2001, p. 247) in EI research. Despite conceding that the label ‘intelligence’ is inadequate and misleading, and considering that their definition lacks an ‘intelligence’ component Petrides and Furnham continue to use it because they want their research to be included in the larger EI field of study (2001, p. 427). Van Der Zee and Wabeke (2004) offer us one warning when considering trait EI, they say “that in order to consider trait-EI as a useful ‘new’ psychological construct, it is necessary to find evidence that indicators of trait-EI do measure something that is different from general traits and that they have predictive value against important real life criteria above general indicators of personality” (Van Der Zee & Wabeke, 2004, p. 244). It is due to this concern that I will not attempt to link trait EI with outdoor leadership, as personality trait research already has significant influence within outdoor leadership (see Miles & Priest, 1999; Priest & Gass, 2005; Martin et al., 2006).

As can be seen, emotional intelligence theory is a large and continually developing academic field. Researchers into this area need to understand the three main EI models and decide which concept best suits their research needs. The synthesising texts on the subject have been helpful in my own understanding of this complicated theory (see Matthews, et al., 2004; Schulze & Roberts, 2005; Zeidner et al., 2009), and in determining the differences between the models. The outdoor leadership texts which do mention EI, tend to adopt the popularised Goleman mixed model as the basis for their understanding despite the suspicion that it receives from within the EI field (Martin et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005; Zeidner, 2009). On the other hand, Hayashi and Ewert (2006; Hayashi, 2005) chose to use an ability EI definition, and Bar-On's mixed model measurement tool for their research study. In the next chapter the correlations between outdoor leadership and each of the EI models will be analysed; and from the existing outdoor literature on emotional intelligence such an analysis seems relevant.

CHAPTER 4: Discussion

“Leadership is intrinsically an emotional process,” (Kerr, et al., 2006, p. 268) where leaders understand the current emotional climate, interpret the climate, formulate a plan based on previous experience, and manage their own and their participant’s emotions in order to achieve shared goals. From what I have covered so far, I can postulate that dependant on the EI model explored, a number of correlations to outdoor leadership will be found, but these will vary in quality and quantity from model to model. I structure my discussion using the three umbrella themes presented in chapter two: understanding, managing, and experiencing. These will serve as headings for my discussion. I examine the three main EI theories, the ability EI, the Bar-On mixed model, and the Goleman mixed model in relation to the outdoor leadership qualities found in the relevant theme. Some elements within the two mixed models overlap each other, so I initially cover them when discussing Bar-On’s model then allude to them in the sections dedicated to Goleman’s model. Due to the interconnected nature of the outdoor leadership qualities, the boundaries of the study, and again in an attempt to avoid repetition, I will only discuss qualities which have been found to contain or relate to emotional elements, correlating these qualities with the competencies and abilities outlined by the different EI models. For a non-exhaustive list of outdoor qualities, which I have compiled, see Table 4.1. I have narrowed the qualities down based on a preliminary scan of emotion related words in the outdoor texts (Cockrell 1991; Graham 1997; Martin, et al 2006; Miles & Priest 1999; Ogilvie 2005; Priest & Gass 2005), eliminating qualities which had a low-to-none surface correlation with feelings or emotions.

Table 4.1
Non-Exhaustive List of Outdoor Qualities

Understanding

Foundational Knowledge	*Self-Efficacy
*Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory	*Self-Awareness
White's Effectance Motivation Theory	*Personality Styles
Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory	*Leadership Styles
*Motivational Locus of Control	*Others-Awareness

Managing

*Group Facilitation (G)	Ethics and Virtues in decisions
Planning	*Leaders attitudes, ethics, virtues (L)
Organising	*Courage and Self-confidence
*Managing risk and safety (C)	*Moods, Emotions effect choices (L)
Supervision strategies	Setting and reaching goals
*Administration (G)	Leaders input into group actions
*Human-nature connection (G)	Differences in group members
Balancing organisational pressures	*Dealing with conflict + crisis' (C)
Foster community building	*Managing energy levels (C)
Using challenge-by-choice philosophy	*Handling group stress (C)
*Informed Judgement (L)	*Courage and self-confidence (L)
Decision-making	

Experiencing

*Experience-based Judgement
*Communication
Technical expertise
*Dealing with Stress/Burn-out
*Flexible leadership style
*Intuition/ Insight
*Learning from Mistakes
*Vulnerability/ Humility while leading

Note. *= emotionally related competencies (G) = group focused (L) = leader focused (C) = combined focus

4.1 Understanding theme

Some of the outdoor qualities covered by the understanding ‘umbrella’ are; self-awareness, others-awareness, self-efficacy, leadership style, personality style, and theories such as multiple intelligence, and motivational locus of control.

4.1.1 ability model

Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) 4-branch model of ability based emotional intelligence (EI) views emotions and intelligence as an interplay of abilities, each affecting the others in various ways, often used in combination. Howard Gardner’s (1984) interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences does influence Mayer and Salovey’s concept of EI (1990; 1997; see Zeidner, Matthew, & Roberts, 2009), and is also part of the teaching sections in some outdoor leadership texts (Martin, Cashel, Wagstaff, & Breunig, 2006; Ogilvie, 2005). Martin, et al. (2006) state that Gardner’s theory can “enrich the outdoor leader’s teaching toolbox,” (p. 176) and Ogilvie concurs saying “successful teaching and leading has to take account of these ‘multiple intelligences’ as much as possible in order to maximise the talents of young people” (2005, p. 256). This is a weak link between the two fields if one sees understanding multiple intelligences as part of a tool-box (as in outdoor leadership) and the other as a precursor to explore the role of cognitive-emotion abilities (as in EI theory).

Often in outdoor text, a person’s *locus of control* is mentioned. In the outdoor leadership context, I believe locus of control is best understood to be either internal or external, for example “effort as internally controllable and fatigue as externally uncontrollable” (Priest & Gass, 2005, p. 56). Priest and Gass (2005) combine several studies to describe the concept (Wiener 1972, 1979, and 1985). In short, where a person perceives the reason for an outcome originating from (either internally or externally, mainly with an emotional language), and if that outcome is

positive or negative, will affect their future level of motivation and risk taking (p. 55-56).

Several abilities within Mayer & Salovey's (1997) model correlate to the theory of motivation, such as the ability to interpret the meanings that emotions convey (e.g. frustration after a failed climb), the ability to label emotions and recognise linguistic relationships (like the link between awe and happiness), the ability to express emotions accurately and the ability to reflectively monitor emotions in relation to their influence.

Since *self-awareness* is considered to be one of the most important aspects of outdoor leadership (Cockrell, 1991; Ewert, 1989; Martin, et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005), it is useful to take some time to analyse the correlations between how outdoor leaders understand self-awareness and how ability EI understands self-awareness. Self-awareness for Mayer & Salovey (1997) is constrained by the narrow focus of their concept (that EI relates to emotions, and intelligence only); thus said, the ability to be aware of one's emotions and thoughts around emotions (essentially Branch I) is a foundational element to self-awareness (Zeidner, et al., 2009). Other aspects of ability EI, such as the regulation of one's emotions and the ability to reflectively engage or detach from one's emotions are also aspects of self-awareness, in that one has to be conscious that those abilities exist in one's self in order to use them. However, they relate to a greater extent to the self-management of emotions as opposed to self-awareness (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Self-awareness could include abilities such as an understanding that my moods affect my current situation or my level of motivation. What I do with that awareness falls under the managing theme. Self-awareness in the outdoor leadership text contains similar emotional aspects, but is much broader in scope. Martin et al. (2005) see self-awareness as being integral to other outdoor qualities and define their self-awareness core-competency as including; "having an

accurate sense of one's abilities and limitations,[and] having knowledge and sensitivity about how we influence others" (p. xiv). It is essential to understand the why's, how's and what's of our personal leadership. The two understandings of self-awareness have similar elements, and the EI abilities can be seen as underlying factors in outdoor leaders' self-awareness. Ogilvie (2005) illustrates the interaction well in his section on self-awareness, with the example of a group lost in mist. He writes, "it is important for this leader to be aware that there may be present an anxiety not to lose the way... the pressure to have immediate reassurance could cause the leader gradually to speed up the pace... and eventually cause distress to the group" (2005, p. 120). What Ogilvie is describing is a leader's ability to identify an emotion, recognise likely transitions among those emotions, whilst understanding that the emotion could unintentionally prioritise thought processes, and a lack of managing the emotion could lead to undesirable emotional consequences in the group. These are all aspects of ability EI.

Self-efficacy, the perception that one can influence one's own actions, is understood in both outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence to be part of social theory (Martin et al., 2006; Priest & Gass, 2005; Zeidner, et al., 2009). Although Abraham (2005) does suggest that the instilling of self-efficacy in followers by leaders is a by-product of self-awareness, it is not understood by any of the EI reviewers to be part of ability EI.

Having an awareness of those around us is invaluable to the outdoor leader. Ogilvie again uses emotional language to relate this to his readers by writing, "Leaders should not assume that because they personally feel comfortable, relaxed, confident, at any given moment, the members of the group feel the same" (2005, p. 124). Knowing the physical and emotional limits of group members allows the leader to manage the group accordingly. Nonverbal communication, one major element of being aware of others mentioned in the outdoor texts, conveys not only

information but a person's feelings to the leader (Martin, et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005). Although the outdoor texts do not define, as succinctly as Mayer & Salovey (1997), the ways in which a leader interprets the nonverbal emotional information presented to them by the group, the understanding that emotions represent a major element, is still present (Martin, et al., 2006; Ogilvie, 2005). The abilities which have the closest correlation to others-awareness include: identifying emotions in other people, the ability to discriminate between accurate and inaccurate expressions of feeling, and the ability to interpret the meanings that emotions convey regarding relationships, such as that sadness often accompanies a loss (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Since understanding both leadership style and personality style have more to do with social theories over and above intelligence, the correlations between them and ability EI are scarce. Research into the correlation between outdoor leadership styles and emotional intelligence have been conducted (see Ewert & Hayashi, 2006; Hayashi, 2005). However, the model and measurements used are not based on the ability EI model, and will be discussed in the following sections. It should be noted that leadership theories such as, situational leadership, servant leadership and caring leadership, do seem to have aspects which correlate to EI abilities, perhaps due to the relational undertones of these theories (Martin et al., 2006).

4.1.2 Bar-On's Mixed Model

Bar-On's model of emotional-social intelligence includes 5 meta-factors, and 15 sub-factors (2007b). The sub-factors and competencies which centre predominantly around awareness and understanding are: self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness and empathy (Bar-On, 2007b). Assertiveness and empathy have slight correlations to aspects of the managing theme as well.

Self-regard, “the ability to accurately perceive, understand and accept ourselves,” (Bar-On, 2007b, ¶. 7) has correlations with outdoor leaders’ self-efficacy, self-awareness, and to an extent, self-confidence and courage. Leaders who know, at a deep level, why they lead are more confident, can summon greater courage in difficult situations, and have a greater sense of their strengths and weaknesses. Graham is putting into an outdoor context, Bar-On’s understanding of self-regard (Graham, 1997; Bar-On, 2007b).

Bar-On’s sub-factor of emotional self-awareness correlates highly with outdoor leadership’s self-awareness quality since Ogilvie (2005) and Graham (1997) both mention a leader’s emotional self-awareness. Bar-On’s (2007b) definition of emotional self-awareness is almost identical to Mayer & Salovey’s (1997) Branch I, so the correlations made in the previous section can be transposed here. It is a credit to the overall emotional intelligence theory that two of the strongest models are relatively similar in their understanding of the foundational emotional abilities.

Assertiveness, in Bar-On’s (2007b) understanding, consists of the ability to non-destructively express thoughts, beliefs, feelings, and have the courage to stand up for one’s rights. Having a background understanding of the origins of these beliefs, rights and feelings is assumed in Bar-On. However it is in this assumption that an overlap occurs to outdoor leaders’ understanding of their own personality style, leadership style and locus of control. Without this background understanding leaders could not even attempt to defend their actions or rights. Bar-On does not make any value statements in relation to this, apart from inferring that by standing up for my rights I am not allowing other people to take advantage of me. I question if assertiveness 1) is an emotionally grounded unique ability, and 2) has its place outside of individual context. Are there not times when controlling my emotions and putting aside my

rights is the more emotionally intelligent course of action? I have in mind a person refusing to take legal action against an outdoor provider after an accident, because of the emotional consequences that might result for all involved.

Outdoor leaders are urged to be empathetic towards their followers (Graham, 1997; Martin, et al., 2006; Miles & Priest, 1999; Priest & Gass, 2005; Ogilvie, 2005), therefore it is no surprise that there is a strong link between the two fields in regard to empathy. Being able to emotionally read people and ‘put yourself in their shoes’ is found in each of the EI models and is highly regarded in outdoor leaders.

A few other sub-factors have overlap with qualities found under the understanding umbrella of outdoor leadership. Reality testing is the process of “testing the degree of correspondence between what we experience and what actually exists” (2007b, ¶ 20). This could have benefits in increasing our understanding of our contextual locus of control. Also, throughout Bar-On’s model, the feeling of having confidence to tackle a social situation or deal with a personal emotional event is described. This ‘feeling of confidence’ could have correlations to a leader’s self-efficacy.

Due to the language Bar-On (2007b) chooses to convey his understanding of the emotional abilities of humans, it is difficult to translate these abilities into other contexts without having to read between the lines. For example a part of assertiveness is my ability to express myself *in general* such as standing up for my rights. As an outdoor leader, does this assertive nature imply having the courage to defend a judgement, or just insisting that a student wear a helmet while mountain biking? I do not know.

4.1.3 Goleman's Mixed Model

In reading through the work by Goleman and colleagues (1995; 1998; Goleman et al., 2002) on emotional intelligence, the terms and concepts are strikingly similar to those used in outdoor leadership. As with Bar-On's mixed model, many of Goleman's competencies stem from personality or general skill areas, and do not necessarily have much to do with emotion or intelligence (Matthews et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2000; Zeidner et al., 2009). I wonder if these areas will add a new element to the understanding of effective outdoor leadership or repeat what is already known?

Two of the competencies under Goleman and colleagues' 'self-awareness' heading, emotional self-awareness and self-assessment, twin Bar-On's self-regard and emotional self-awareness sub-factors. These have been discussed in the previous section, so I will refrain from repetition here. Suffice to say that these both highly overlap outdoor leadership qualities encompassed by the understanding theme.

The third competency of self-awareness in Goleman's mixed EI model is 'self-confidence', understood as the 'presence' and self-assurance that allows leaders to "stand out in a group" (Goleman et al., 2002, p. 254). I am unsure if self-efficacy facilitates self-confidence or if self-confidence facilitates self-efficacy in a leader but it is clear that there is a connection between them. Much like Martin et al.'s (2006) assertion that the core-competency of self-awareness is foundational to the other competencies, so Goleman, et al. (2002) state that self-awareness is the foundation of emotionally intelligent leadership.

In a similar thread, Goleman's social competencies could be seen as providing a foundation to the managing qualities of outdoor leadership. Having an 'others-awareness' as an outdoor leader encompasses more than what is covered by 'social-awareness', for instance

perceiving a followers physical wellbeing. However being empathetic, and understanding organisational trends is important for people at any level of outdoor leadership. My only concern with making this correlation is that apart from showing empathy, Goleman and colleagues' social awareness competency does not have much to do with the emotional elements of understanding others, and/or perceiving their emotional state in order to take better care of them. Goleman et al. (2002) mention that having an understanding of the power of emotions, and finding effective ways to improve how one handles their own and others' emotions is what sets the best leaders apart. I can see a slight correlation between this and understanding one's emotional locus of control; which would warrant further study outside of the parameters of this exploratory study, but for now the correlation is a weak one.

4.1.4 Summary

Understanding, recognising, and verbally representing one's own emotions, the emotions of others and how those feelings impact on other qualities of leadership is common in both fields. There are similar theoretical foundations to outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence, although the outdoor leadership texts have, until recently, down-played the apparent influence of a person's emotions on how they perceive the context they are in. Emotional intelligence theories could strengthen this 'foundational knowledge' and lead to better managing qualities in outdoor leadership. If those qualities found under the understanding theme are foundational to other qualities (Martin, et al., 2006; Goleman, 2002), it can be extrapolated that leaders, who have a greater cognitive-emotional understanding, will grow in the emotional aptitude of their managing and experiencing qualities.

4.2 Managing Theme

The qualities found within the managing theme are extensive since this theme is where leader's understanding, awareness, and knowledge combine with their experiences in action. The managing theme is the 'doing' part of leadership. Of the twelve qualities noted in Table 4.1, four or five of these can be clustered together based on their focus or orientation. The three cluster orientations which emerge are, group focus (G), leader focus (L) and a combination of the two (C). Group focus includes qualities such as; group facilitation, supervision, administration, and handling group stresses. Leader focused qualities include, informed judgement, courage and self-confidence, and those moods/emotions, which affect choice. In the third cluster orientation, qualities which can focus on the group, leader, or both depending on context exist; these include, managing safety and risk, developing the human-nature relationship, dealing with conflict and crisis', managing energy levels, and leader's attitudes, ethics, and virtues. For ease of analysis I will address each cluster, rather than each quality separately, for correlations to the EI models, only mentioning individual qualities for clarification. I suspect that ability EI will have weak correlations to this theme given that it focuses on core-aptitude rather than core-competencies (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) and that the mixed models will have higher correlations due to the shared focus on competencies. Mayer & Salovey (1997) do address emotional competence and achievement in their paper, stating that

emotional intelligence represents the core aptitude... emotional achievement represents the learning a person has attained about emotion... and emotional competence exists when one has reached a required level of achievement... From at least a theoretical standpoint, it makes sense to develop the ideas of emotional intelligence, emotional achievement, and emotional competence together. (p. 15)

4.2.1 Ability EI Model

Despite the seeming allowance by Mayer & Salovey for emotional intelligence, achievement and competence to be lumped together, for the purposes of this study, I will stick to the narrow parameters of ability emotional intelligence under the 4-branch model (1997).

Group-focused management qualities, such as group facilitation and handling group stresses, in the outdoor context are often understood to occur during debriefing or facilitation sessions (Priest & Gass, 1999; Ogilvie, 2005). These are times when groups are to be open with each other and to bring up any positives or negatives from the activity/day/trip (Brown, 2002; Phipps, 1991; Priest & Gass, 2005). Emotionally intelligent abilities can assist leaders during these times. For instance being able to identify and label emotions and the causes of such feelings (Mayer & Salovey, 1990; 1997). On top of these structured times, there are unstructured moments throughout the day when leaders must focus their leadership qualities towards the groups needs. In Martin et al., (2006) a story is shared about an outdoor leadership course with three leaders, Mike, Kate, and Jordan. Before a hiking section of this particular trip, where the leaders would allow the group members to go off on their own hikes the leaders had yet to witness any conflict in the group and wondered when it would occur so that the next stage of group development could start. The group had a final facilitation session, the night before the self-lead hikes. Suddenly, several members of the group burst out into tears and many more followed. As things settled down and the leaders got to their tent, they began to discuss what had just occurred and how to handle it. Several options were discussed, and the leaders chose to put their own desires behind the needs of the group. The next day the leaders monitored how the group members were feeling and everything had normalised, so they allowed the group to continue with the self-lead hike (p. 134-135; see APPENDIX E for full story). The emotional

situation that the leaders face require of them many EI abilities, including but not limited to the ability to interpret meanings that emotions convey, the ability to stay open to both pleasant and unpleasant feelings, the ability to reflectively monitor personal and others emotions, and knowing that emotional mood swings change an individuals perspective (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The leaders in the story demonstrate many qualities of effective leaders and the varying degree to which EI abilities can correlate to managing groups.

EI abilities, based on Mayer & Salovey's (1997) model can have an effect on leader focused managing qualities; although, much like many of the management qualities, this influence is subtle. Firstly, having courage and self-confidence do not correlate to EI abilities, as this model outlines since it is not a matter of emotion or intelligence specifically. However, having the ability to recognise that one's mood will change the perspective that one views potential risks, and using one's emotions to encourage a 360 view for problem solving (Graham, 1997) correlates strongly to the quality of informed judgement.

Those leadership qualities which focus on both leader and group management, like managing risk and safety, the human-nature connection, conflicts, and energy levels, in my opinion correlate highly to EI abilities. Risk management in the field is often related to a cost-benefit analysis of some kind (Ajango, 2000; 2002; Cain, 1991; Graham, 1997). Given that emotions factor into cost-benefit analysis and judgements extensively (Blanchette & Richards, 2009; Mameli, 2004), leaders with the ability to recognise that their emotions are prioritising the options list, and understand that by changing one's mood new options can be considered, should be at a greater advantage when faced with quick risk management decisions. In looking at managing the human-nature connection while in the field, a leader who has a greater ability to stay open to and understand and interpret complex feelings, in recognising when an emotional

response could arise out of a picturesque landscape could facilitate a ‘magic moment’ and aid in the human-nature connection for group members. Lastly, with regard to managing energy levels, a leader with the ability to understand how moods / emotions affect people, could perhaps generate a positive mood in order to lift a group’s spirits and energy levels.

The abilities outlined in Mayer & Salovey’s (1997) EI model are purposely narrow by description so that the two core parts, emotion and intelligence, of EI can be better understood. It is only with a little bit of deduction and conceptual enquiry that the correlations between ability EI and the managing theme, were extrapolated. It would be exciting to see further studies explore just how much EI abilities influence a leader’s managing qualities.

4.2.2 Bar-On’s Mixed EI Model

As stated above, the way that Bar-On chooses to describe emotional-social intelligence has its difficulties with regard to analysing possible correlations. With regard to the managing theme of outdoor leadership qualities, Bar-On’s mixed EI model has strong correlations under the stress management meta-factor, and in his explanation of the problem-solving sub-factor. However, the sub-factor of interpersonal relationships, does not seem to relate to any of the group, leader or combined-focus managing clusters. Relationship building is a large part of outdoor leadership, but Bar-On’s (2007b) understanding relates to mutual satisfaction in the giving and receiving of feelings leading to intimacy. In my experience, outdoor leaders rarely cultivate long-term mutual relationships with their followers. Unless the interactions are long enough or frequent enough to allow for a deeper level of trust to form, I see minimal correlation with the Bar-On model’s sub-factor of interpersonal relationships. Potentially, in the realm of outdoor education a correlation could be made to this sub-factor, given that often leaders have ongoing contact with students over a number of months during longer expeditions.

Bar-On (2007b) does not include an ability which relates to how a person perceives emotion in nature or landscapes. Perhaps having an understanding of others emotional states, could help the outdoor leader manage a follower's connection with the environment, but in Bar-On's model, there are no abilities mentioned which correlate to the underlying recognition or action of managing that connection.

The sub-factors of 'stress management', stress tolerance and impulse control, correlate to group focused qualities strongly in that much of group-focused leadership qualities centre around a leader being able to manage the demands of the roles/group/risks present. I believe that this meta-factor correlates highly with qualities that effective leaders possess. Both group-focused qualities, such as supervision, administration and handling a group's stress, and combined-focus qualities like managing risk and safety, and dealing with conflict entail situations of high stress for outdoor leaders. According to Bar-On (2007b), this meta-factor allows people to manage their emotions in a way in which the emotions can work for them, rather than against them. It includes "having a repertoire of suitable responses to stressful situations," (¶. 12) and not allowing one's emotions to take control of a reaction. This sounds extraordinarily similar to the outdoor texts, which refer to leaders needing to control their emotions when faced with decisions, and I believe that they are essentially the same idea, although in my experience many outdoor leaders interpret controlling emotion as suppressing emotion. The Bar-On model is an expanded version of that idea and presents a more sophisticated understanding.

4.2.3 Goleman's Mixed Model

I shall now look at Goleman and colleagues model of EI, again briefly mentioning competencies which overlap with Bar-On's model and are already discussed in the previous sections.

When it comes to the qualities in outdoor leadership which are clustered together because of their focus on the leader, Goleman et al.'s (2002) self-management competency has multiple areas of correlation. Goleman and colleagues refer to how leaders must first understand their own emotions, and manage themselves well before expecting to manage others. They talk about how leaders must manage the effects that their moods have on their followers in order to gain maximal performance, and that leaders who have mastered their emotions are better able to manage their attitudes and impulses, enabling transparency – a leadership virtue – and assisting in an integral and ethical leadership style (Goleman, et al., 2002). It seems as though Goleman is speaking the same language that outdoor leaders speak.

Goleman and colleagues do not refer to managing risk in the same way that an outdoor leader would understand it, although Goleman (1998) does say that emotionally intelligent leaders will be able to handle and adapt more readily to both emotional and non-emotional needs by smoothly handling multiple demands, shifting personal and group priorities and adapting to rapid change. These leaders will adapt their responsibility and tactics to fit fluid circumstances and will have a greater level of flexibility in how they perceive events (Goleman, 1998, p. 95). Although this could relate to a larger extent to having a flexible leadership style, it could be inferred that managing a group's safety and risk requires the above qualities. Due to the context and intended audience of Goleman, et al's (2002) book *Primal Leadership*, a case could be made for the correlation of Goleman's EI model and the group-focused managing qualities associated with administration and supervision in outdoor leadership. However, on closer inspection, all

Goleman and colleagues descriptions of relationship management competencies are not reliant on the emotional regulation of others, as in the ability EI model. It seems, rather, that they would best be described as tools for the leader's tool kit which might –or might not- involve feelings. Take, for example, the competency of *teamwork and collaboration*. An effective leader creates a friendly atmosphere, models cooperation, helpfulness and respect, and brings others into team tasks by building spirit and team identity all while creating close relationships beyond the work environment. How is this different from many of the aims of initiative games, or the work of an extroverted leader? Again, I struggle to see how this competency will add to outdoor leadership's understanding of what already occurs in the field, and its overall correlation to the term emotional intelligence.

Other qualities of group management that the Goleman EI model does not strongly correlate to include managing the human-nature connection and how a leader's emotional understanding can aid in group facilitation above and beyond elements of personality.

4.2.4 Summary

Each of the emotional intelligence models had areas of high overlap with managing qualities of outdoor leadership, and each of them had areas of low overlap. The ability model had greater overlap than initially anticipated, and the potential for this understanding of emotional intelligence to add to an outdoor leader's practice is remarkable. Only the ability model overlapped with managing the human-nature connection; however, both mixed models had high overlap with the qualities required to manage safety and risk. All three models overlapped with qualities associated with group-focused management, like group facilitation, and handling group stress. All three also overlapped with leader-focused qualities.

4.3 Experiencing Theme

The third theme of experiencing consists of those qualities which require a longer time scale, a variety of contexts, and an element of input from someone with more experience. These qualities include experience-based judgement, communication, flexibility in leadership style, intuition / insight, humility or vulnerability, an openness to learn from mistakes and dealing with personal stress or burn out.

4.3.1 Ability EI Model

I believe that the majority of Mayer & Salovey's (1997) EI abilities correlate to the experiencing qualities mentioned above. Although qualities like experience-based judgement, and flexibility in leadership style do not explicitly mention emotions, research has shown that emotions cannot be separated from the decision-making / judgement processes (Ajango, 2005; Blanchette & Richards, 2009; Mameli, 2004); studies also show that leaders with high EI are more likely to effect change at any level of an organisation (Kerr et al., 2006; Palmer et al., 2001). Different leadership styles require different levels of involvement, and each of those a different method of communicating information (see Martin et al., 2006; Priest & Gass, 2005; Ogilvie, 2005). I believe that abilities such as actively engaging or disengaging emotions depending on perceived utility, or knowing how a future situation can have emotional effects on a group will allow leaders to use flexibility in leadership to a greater extent. Mayer & Salovey (1997) assert that a person's emotional life-experience and context greatly determine the outcome of a person's behaviour, not a person's emotional intelligence. Rather, a person's EI "encourages a process of personal investigation" which occurs in a specific context (1997, p. 16). Translated into the outdoor context, leaders with a higher propensity to EI will investigate the

emotional correlations in their leadership and use their experiences to build on their cognitive-emotional abilities.

4.3.2 Bar-On's Mixed EI Model

The qualities of outdoor leadership which fall under the experiencing theme take much longer to cultivate, and perhaps it is in the accumulation of experience that these qualities are learned. Bar-On's (2007b) meta-factors of 'adaptability' and 'stress management' also have this experiencing criterion. Reality testing, for Bar-On, is the process of "testing the degree of correspondence between what we experience and what actually exists" (2007b, ¶ 20). Reality testing involves an element of intuition and insight, self-awareness, and vulnerability. It is an authentication process in which leaders can validate their experiences; it is an important element in experience-based judgement. Outdoor leadership's 'flexible leadership style' involves adaptation, openness and creativity based on the context and the tactics required while leading. 'Flexibility' in Bar-On's emotional-social intelligence model correlates well with the outdoor understanding of the same term because people who are emotionally flexible are not rigid to their course of action, and will change their thoughts, feelings and behaviours if mistaken (2007b). This sub-factor also has conceptual correlations with the outdoor qualities of vulnerability and learning from mistakes. The last sub-factor, problem solving, is extremely similar to an outdoor leader's understanding of decision-making and judgement. In this respect the two correlate highly. I have issue however in that the way in which Bar-On (2007b) describes problem solving does not involve emotion, only 'sensing' and 'feeling confident'. Bar-On is describing a general skill, not an emotionally intelligent ability.

4.3.3 Goleman's Mixed EI Model

Of the seven qualities outlined under the experiencing theme, Goleman and colleagues mixed model has strong correlations with three, slight correlations with two and little-to-none with two. Interwoven through Goleman, et al. (2002) is the understanding that leadership is learned over time, and that “none of these lessons [in leadership] involves explicit instruction... they arise naturally in the course of life” (p. 155).

First I will look at the qualities with strong EI correlations. Dealing with stress effectively comes from experiencing stressful situations and handling them appropriately. Goleman et al. (2002) say that an effective leader with self-control will stay calm and clear headed while under stress or in a crisis; also, leaders with high adaptability are able to juggle numerous demands without losing focus. Goleman, et al. (2002) specifically mention leadership styles and that emotionally intelligent leaders are flexible in the style they use depending on the situation presented to them; elements of the adaptability competency fit with the outdoor qualities of flexible leadership. Lastly, a leader needs to develop intuition and insight over time. This quality is expressed in Goleman's model through social awareness, self-awareness and developing the where-with-all to be a catalyst for change. These competencies only occur through experience.

Goleman and colleagues' model have minor correlations to the qualities that allow leaders to learn from their mistakes and exhibit vulnerability and humility in leadership. Both of these qualities can be correlated with the competency of transparency, “an authentic openness to others about one's feelings, beliefs, and actions” (Goleman, et al., 2002, p. 47). Similarly, being vulnerable and exhibiting humility, can build a leader's integrity and trustworthiness.

The qualities of outdoor leadership, refined by experience in which Goleman's model does not correlate are communication, and experience based judgement. Although, Goleman and colleagues do infer that emotionally intelligent leaders who collaborate with and develop teams have good communication skills, they do not relate those communication skills to emotion. In a similar manner the authors slightly relate emotional concepts to judgements.

4.3.4 Summary

The outdoor leadership qualities found under the experiencing theme are often referred to as the 'meta-skills' of outdoor leadership (Martin et al., 2006; Priest & Gass, 2005; Ogilvie, 2005). Given the strong correlations between them and each of the EI models, significantly ability EI and Bar-On's mixed model, Hayashi and Ewert's (2006) postulation that "emotional intelligence could be considered an important component of meta skills in helping outdoor leaders use existing skills more effectively," (p. 225) seems conceptually accurate.

4.4 Summary of Analysis and Preferred Model

From this conceptual exploration into the correlations between outdoor leadership qualities and the three emotional intelligence models, it is seen that there are many links between the two fields of study.

Ability EI does not correlate highly in the terminology and language used, but rather connects at the foundational level, in what is often not mentioned in outdoor texts due to its 'common sense' nature. The emotional abilities described if 'brought out into the light' so to speak, could greatly help outdoor leaders refine and enhance their practice. Mayer & Salovey's narrow definition gives this model strength in that the concept is precise and there is little confusion over what the term 'emotional intelligence' refers to. For future researchers the

measurement tool of ability EI (the MSCEIT) has received positive feedback, and does not come under the scrutiny that self-report measures receive. Finally, the ability EI model answers the question of *why* emotionally intelligent people excel based on the foundational abilities which allow them to understand, connect and influence people.

Bar-On's (2007b) mixed model also has strong correlations with outdoor leadership qualities in both understanding and terminology. This model would perhaps be easier to assimilate into the work on outdoor leadership qualities because of this. The competencies expressed in Bar-On's mixed model are broad and at times vague so-as-to come under criticism from his contemporaries. Bar-On's self-report measurement tool is contentious; yet, it is widely reported as the most reliable mixed EI test (Matthews et al., 2004; Neubauer & Freudenthaler, 2005; Zeidner, et al., 2009).

Goleman (1998; Goleman et al., 2002), in my opinion, describes how to be more emotionally savvy, rather than how to be more intelligent with one's emotions, preferring to concentrate on competencies and skills rather than foundational abilities. While studying Goleman's mixed model (1995; 1998) and the writings by the author, I kept asking myself if he was not just describing a person who had a lot of energy, a friendly demeanour, and good social skills. For research purposes the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) is not yet a strong measurement tool (Matthews, et al. 2004; Zeidner, et al. 2009). There is also confusion over what is personality, general skill and emotional ability under the heading Emotional Intelligence in Goleman's mixed model. Obvious in the popularity of Goleman's concept is that it resonates with current leaders in a multitude of fields, being an approachable and easily understood concept. It does link well with existing outdoor leadership practices, and explicit in the material describing the model is the assertion that these competencies and skills can easily be taught to

leaders. Both of the mixed models overlap linguistically; however, one must remember that outdoor leadership concepts have adopted many other theories and constructs from other academic fields, such as personality trait theories. Perhaps these correlations are evident because the mixed models are actually describing general skills and aspects of personality that already exist in the same form in outdoor leadership. The question that researchers and practitioners must ask, based on these statements, is whether mixed EI theories add enough new knowledge to our field as to warrant application of EI into outdoor leadership training.

Despite all of this, my preferred model for understanding emotional intelligence is the original ability-based EI model described by Mayer, Salovey, and colleagues (Mayer & Salovey, 1990; 1997; Mayer et al., 2000; 2004). The measurement tool is gaining credibility, and the abilities described highlight the cognitive-emotional foundations to many outdoor leadership qualities. Although Mayer & Salovey (1997) do not specifically state that EI can be taught in a curriculum, they mention that these abilities develop over time, mainly during childhood, and that the importance of informal relationships in the acquiring of EI is critical. I believe that in the context of the informal relationships of outdoor leadership, education, and even recreation, our field can benefit in an assimilation of the ability EI model into our current literature. This EI model will bring into our field a new understanding of how to maximise our leadership qualities, not only in the relational qualities, but throughout the understanding, managing, and experiencing themes.

4.5 Issues In Combining the Two Fields

Despite the numerous correlations between EI theory and outdoor leadership, there are a few issues in trying to combine the two fields. Some stem from internal debates amongst the researchers in the fields, and others stem from the similarities between the two. A whole other study of similar length could be done on where the limitations are, such is the nature of trying to combine two rapidly developing, large fields of study. I will mention only a few limitations and let those interested in the topic search out the others.

Firstly, emotional intelligence has its critics. With three, possibly four leading models, and a number of off-shoots to those models, it does not appear that one clear and relevant EI model will be agreed upon soon. Perhaps in time, the EI stone will be polished enough for the academic river to release it from the rapids, but not yet. So, with EI advocates stating that the theory is robust and the measurement tools are sufficiently validated against personality or intellect, and EI critics claiming that more work is still needed to add reliability to measurement tools, would combining an EI model to outdoor leadership be premature? Although, it may be that the outdoor leadership context can help support EI researchers and give them a wider-reaching contextual arena outside of the business world in order to assist in the quest?

If researchers into outdoor leadership choose to study the impact of leaders emotional intelligence, then I believe that only one model should be assimilated. I have put forth my preferred model, and Hayashi and Ewert (2006) put forth theirs. One limitation to the wider EI theory is its lack of a unified face. This is a significant limitation for the outdoor researcher in need of a model to follow and to structure their research around. I do not believe that it would serve the outdoor field any benefit to do research using multiple models of EI. Along with choosing a model, outdoor researchers must also decide which EI measurement tool is reliable enough to add credibility to outdoor leadership research, and not subtract from it.

The next limitation to combining the two fields is the question of which model of EI would be different enough to existing outdoor leadership knowledge, so to add relevance to both emotional intelligence theory and outdoor leadership? Although in this particular study, similarities are viewed as positive, one could argue that too many similarities on the linguistic or conceptual level nullifies the benefit of combining the two fields. One could ask, if we are already talking about the same things, why adopt a new way of speaking to convey the same information?

One final limitation, is the debate over if EI can be taught to leaders. It has been established that leadership competencies and skills can be taught, at least in part, through schooling. When it comes to emotional intelligence, this question is only answerable depending on the model of EI that one chooses. Goleman (1998) suggests that training which focuses “on the [emotional] competencies needed most for excellence in a given job or role” (p. 251) should be given to managers. Although Mayer and Salovey (1997) do not make any such suggestions, they recognise that emotional abilities can be cultivated in leaders over time through meaningful relationships. Ashkanasky and Dasborough (2003) concluded in their study on this subject “that students in leadership courses should be more than simply bystanders when studying the impact of emotions and emotional intelligence on performance,” (p. 21) and that in educating students “active personal involvement” is important (p. 21).

How EI is applied is largely based on the outcomes of the limitations which exist in the combination of the two fields. The predominant issue being which model should outdoor researchers adopt to explore the emotional intelligence of outdoor leaders.

4.6 Possible Applications of Preferred Model into Outdoor Leadership

Since I prefer the ability based model, I will attempt to outline a few possible applications of this EI model into outdoor leadership.

First I will look at if EI can be taught to aspiring outdoor leaders. Ashkanasy and Dasborough (2003) chose the ability based model of EI, and used the MSCEIT test and a small self-report EI survey during their study. They found that there is potential for a role in EI, or knowledge about emotions, in teaching young leaders. This study, and those that they cite, recommends, that practices which put EI abilities into action are important for the learning of EI. This suggests to me, that if outdoor leaders are taught emotional intelligence abilities in an experiential education framework, then there is potential to enhance the influence of those leaders. For if leaders understand emotions and can perceive them within group members, then leaders will be better able to guide and model ways in which these emotions, either positive or negative, can be translated into other situations. Research into this application would be useful for both the EI and outdoor leadership concepts.

Secondly, a possible application of ability EI into outdoor leadership is within the facilitation skills of outdoor leaders. Having a foundation of emotionally intelligent abilities can aid the leader in many of the aspects of personal and group facilitation. As one example, understanding the challenge by choice philosophy, and what is meant by a 'comfort zone' will allow a leader a modicum of success as they lead groups. They will be able to recognise the nonverbal cues that a people give when they surpass their comfort zone, and be able to interpret their emotional responses when faced with large challenges, plus all the peer or self imposed pressures. An emotionally intelligent leader can have a greater sensitivity to the participant's needs at that moment. Whether that be a gentle nudge, a firm encouragement or a welcoming exit from the activity.

A third potential application of ability EI into the outdoor field is through adventure therapy, conflict resolution initiatives or through respite camps. Mayer and Salovey (1997) describe one conflict resolution programme from the United States which teaches students how to identify the emotions present in a conflict from all perspectives. From the students own, to their opponent, to those that are externally involved (p. 21). Participants in outdoor programmes who have yet to be exposed to such conflict resolution tactics, are increasingly common. Leaders who have the ability to recognise, interpret, and manage emotions well would be good role models and would be able to handle the stresses of such programmes effectively.

Lastly, I can see a good application for emotional intelligence in crisis response situations. Having leaders which span the breadth of the outdoor field, from activity guide to programme directors, knowledgeable about emotionally intelligence tactics could have a significant impact on safety education and crisis response in our field. Ajango (2005) shares several case studies that highlight some great and some less than great emotionally intelligent actions by leaders in the outdoor field. I can see that by incorporating the ability EI concepts into our safety education and viewing similar case studies through an emotionally intelligent lens, our field can address some of these issues that Ajango raises.

CHAPTER 5. Conclusion

Many outdoor leadership texts distil the complex processes of leading into highly scientific, theory-laden checklists of skills or competencies; conveying the message that effective outdoor leaders are people who use these scientific methods or master these competencies. The emotional qualities of these leaders have received less attention, despite my personal experience that highly influential outdoor leaders use emotional qualities to achieve their outcomes more effectively than scientific methods. Recently, emotional intelligence (EI) concepts have been related to outdoor leadership (Hayashi, 2005; Martin, Cashel, Wagstaff & Breunig, 2006), hinting that emotional intelligence could have further reaching implications for leadership.

This paper attempted to 1) investigate the conceptual and linguistic relationship between emotional intelligence theories and outdoor leadership, 2) enhance the understanding of emotional intelligence in the outdoor education field for future studies and 3) discover if there is a clear case for the importance of emotional intelligence in outdoor leadership training.

This exploratory study took a step back and asked the basic questions of ‘how’ and ‘if’ the two fields should be linked. I outline the main models of emotional intelligence, then conceptually and linguistically find correlations between these models and outdoor leadership under the three umbrella themes of a) understanding, b) managing and c) experiencing. The findings revealed that correlations between outdoor leadership and EI are strong but vary in quantity and quality, according to the EI model, and have ramifications for future work that combines the two fields.

Firstly, both fields are academically young, yet draw from academic foundations in multiple areas. Both fields are being refined through academic research into their constructs and this constant shifting in concepts provides a potentially volatile academic environment for cross-over work to find itself in. Secondly, if outdoor leaders are going to assimilate EI into their

practice, or conduct research into the emotional intelligence of outdoor leaders, they must understand the different models and choose a model to collectively start from, complete with its existing measurement tools. This choice will determine the areas between outdoor leadership and emotional intelligence which can be explored, and if it can be taught. Finally, the choice of EI model that is chosen by researchers and writers on outdoor leadership will determine the type and level of application of EI into the outdoor context. I surmise that unless one model is chosen and agreed upon, then a clear-case for the importance of emotional intelligence in outdoor leadership training will not appear.

At the end of my analysis I chose the ability EI model conceptualised by Mayer, Salovey and colleagues as my preferred model to integrate into outdoor leadership. This model views EI narrowly under its component terms ‘emotion’ and ‘intelligence’, and uses maximal performance testing measures above self-report measures. Finally, I put forth three potential applications for practice and future research based on this model.

It has been a long journey from the initial dissonance I experienced in my exposure to outdoor theory and practice. I feel as if one of my big internal questions has been answered, only to be replaced by another. As I worked my way through this conceptual exploration, I realised that my own emotional intelligence abilities have been locked away in a closet gathering dust and cobwebs. The next step for me is to find praxis in my outdoor leadership guided by a fuller understanding of how my emotions effect my leadership.

References

- Abraham, R. (2005). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: a review and synthesis. In R. Shulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence: an international handbook* (pp. 255-270). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Ajango, D. (2000). *Lessons learned: a guide to accident prevention and crisis response*. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Outdoor & Experiential Education.
- Ajango, D. (2005). *Lessons learned II: using case studies and history to improve safety education*. Eagle River, AK: SafetyEd.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2003). Emotional awareness and emotional intelligence in leadership training. *Journal of Education for Business*, September/October, 18-22.
- Bailey, J. (1999). A world of adventure education. In J. C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 39-42). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the emotional quotient inventory. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 363-388). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2007a). *A broad definition of emotional-social intelligence according to the Bar-On model*. (April 18, 2007), Retrieved November 2, 2007 from www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-model/essay.php?i=2
- Bar-On, R. (2007b). *The 5 meta-factors and 15 sub-factors of the Bar-On model*. (April 18, 2007), Retrieved October 22, 2009 from www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-model/essay.php?i=3#

- Bar-On, R. & Parker, J. D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berman D., & Davis-Berman, J. (2002). An integrated approach to crisis management in wilderness settings. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 2(1), 9-17.
- Blanchette, I., & Richards, A. (2009). The influence of affect on higher level cognition: a review of research on interpretation, judgement, decision making and reasoning. *Cognition and Emotion*, (August 21), 1-35. Retrieved October 7, 2009, from Informaworld database.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: insights from the emotional competence inventory. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, M. (2002). The facilitator as gatekeeper: A critical analysis of social order in facilitation sessions. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning*, (2)2, 101-112.
- Cain, K. (1991). Judgment and decision-making ability. In D. Cockrell (Ed.), *The wilderness educator: the wilderness education association curriculum guide* (pp. 13-34). Merrillville, IN: ICS Books.
- Cockrell, D. (Ed.). (1991). *The wilderness educator: The wilderness education association curriculum guide*. Merrillville, IN: ICS Books.
- Conte, J. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 433-440.

- Conroy, J. C., Davis, R. A., & Enslin, P. (2008). Philosophy as a bias for policy and practice: what confidence can we have in philosophical analysis and argument?. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 42(S1), 165-182.
- Crosby, S., & Bensemen, J. (2002). Vivisecting the tui: the qualifications framework and outdoor leadership development in New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(2), 34-44.
- de Vries, M., Holland, R. W., & Witteman, C. L. M. (2008). Fitting decisions: mood and intuitive versus deliberative decision strategies. *Cognition and Emotion*, 22(5), 931-943. Retrieved October 7, 2009, from Informaworld database.
- Ewert, A. (1989). *Outdoor adventure pursuits: foundations, models, and theories*. Scottsdale, AZ: Publishing Horizons.
- Gardner, H. (1984). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences*. London: Heinemann.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Graham, J. (1997). *Outdoor leadership: technique, common sense & self confidence*. Seattle, WA: The Mountaineers.
- Gray, D. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London: SAGE.

- Groves, K. S., McEnrue, M. P., & Shen, W. (2008). Developing and measuring the emotional intelligence of leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(2), 225-250.
- Hayashi, A. (2005). Emotional intelligence and outdoor leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 27(3), 333-335.
- Hayashi, A., & Ewert, A. (2006). Outdoor leaders' emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 28(3), 222-242.
- Hodgson, T. (2000). Vulnerability and leadership in outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 4(2), 53-58.
- Humberstone, B. (2000). The 'outdoor industry' as social and educational phenomena: gender and outdoor adventure/education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 1(1), 21-35. Retrieved October 21, 2009, from InformaWorld database.
- Hunt, J. S., Jr. (2000). Ethical foundations of wilderness risk management. In D. Ajango (Ed.), *Lessons learned: a guide to accident prevention and crisis response* (pp. 157-175). Anchorage, AK: Alaska Outdoor & Experiential Education.
- Hunt, J. S., Jr., & Wurdinger, S. (1999). Ethics and adventure programming. In J. C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 123-132). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of emotional and behavioural reactions to job insecurity. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 361-372. Retrieved July 26, 2009, from JSTOR database.
- Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 27(4), 265-279.

- King, J. (1998). What is a philosophical analysis?. *Philosophical Studies*, 90, 155-179.
- Langmuir, E. (2004), *Mountaincraft and leadership* (rev 3rd ed.) Manchester, UK: Mountain Leader Training England.
- Lois, J. (2001). Managing emotions, intimacy, and relationships in a volunteer search and rescue group. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 30(2), 131-179. Retrieved July 9, 2009, from SAGE database.
- Lugg, A. (2004). Outdoor adventure in Australian outdoor education: is it a case of roast for Christmas dinner?. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(1), 4-11.
- Mameli, M. (2004). The role of emotions in ecological and practical rationality. In D. Evans & P. Cruse (Eds.), *Emotion, Evolution, and Rationality* (pp. 159-178). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2004). *Emotional intelligence: science and myth*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Martin, P. (2004). Outdoor adventure in promoting relationships with nature. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(1), 20-28.
- Martin, P., Cashel, C., Wagstaff, M., & Breunig, M. (2006). *Outdoor leadership: theory and practice*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, cognition and personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence?. In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as mental ability. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 92-119). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: theory, findings and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215.
- McDonald, P. (2000). *Issues of progress: trends in the training of outdoor leaders*. Dunedin, NZ: Author. Retrieved October 14, 2009, from <http://homepages.paradise.net.nz/petemcd/>
- Neubauer, A. C., & Freudenthaler, H. H. (2005). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. Shultze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence: an international handbook* (pp. 31-50). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Nicol, R. (2002). Outdoor education: research topic or universal value? Part two. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 2(2), 81-99.
- Ogilvie, K. (2005). *Leading and managing groups in the outdoors* (Rev. ed.). Penrith, UK: The Institute for Outdoor Learning.
- Outdoors WA. (2007). *National Outdoor Leader Registration Scheme*. Retrieved from <http://www.outdoorswa.org/page.php?id=25>
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(1), 5-10.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 425-448.

- Phipps, M. (1991). Group dynamics in the outdoors: A model for teaching outdoor leaders. In D. Cockrell (Ed.), *The wilderness educator: the wilderness education association curriculum guide* (pp. 35-64). Merrillville, IN: ICS Books.
- Priest, S., & Gass, M. (2005). *Effective leadership in adventure programming* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Raab, N. (1997). Becoming an expert in not knowing: reframing teacher as consultant. *Management Learning*, 28(2), 161-175.
- Sehon, S. R., & Stanley, D. E. (2003). A philosophical analysis of the evidence-based medicine debate. *BMC Health Services Research*, 3(14), 1-10. Retrieved October 19, 2009, from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/3/14>
- Shultz, D., Izard, C., & Abe, J. A. (2005). The emotion systems and the development of emotional intelligence. In R. Shulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence: an international handbook* (pp. 51-68). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Shulze, R., Roberts, R. D., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2005). Theory, measure, and applications of emotional intelligence: frames of reference. In R. Shulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence: an international handbook* (pp. 31-50). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Thomas, G. (2008). Preparing facilitators for experiential education: the role of intentionality and intuition. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 8(1), 3-20.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group Organization Management*, 2, 419-427. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from SAGE database.

- Van der Zee, K., & Wabeke, R. (2004). Is trait-emotional intelligence *simply* or *more than just* a trait?. *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 243-263.
- Waterhouse, L. (2006). Multiple intelligences, the mozart effect, and emotional intelligence: a critical review. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(4), 207-225.
- Wattchow, B. (2007). Book review. Outdoor leadership: theory and practice. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(1), 50-52.
- Warren, K. (2007). Book review – outdoor leadership: theory and practice. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(3), 433-436.
- Woollven, R., Allison, P., & Higgins, P. (2007). Perception and reception: the introduction of licensing of adventure activities in Great Britain. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 30(1), 1-20.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: how it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*. Cambridge: MIT Press.